

Message

From: Campbell, Chad (Tester) [Chad_Campbell@tester.senate.gov]
Sent: 2/29/2016 5:08:33 PM
To: Russo, Rebecca [Russo.Rebecca@epa.gov]; Cirian, Mike [Cirian.Mike@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: CFAC Questions
Attachments: Answers to Columbia Falls City Council for 2_16 meeting.DOCX

Sorry forgot to attach the document from Glencore.

From: Campbell, Chad (Tester)
Sent: Monday, February 29, 2016 9:21 AM
To: 'Russo, Rebecca'; Mike Cirian (cirian.mike@epa.gov)
Cc: DiLuccia, Janelle (Tester); Swanson, Dayna (Tester) (Dayna_Swanson@tester.senate.gov); Laslovich, Dylan (Tester) (Dylan_Laslovich@tester.senate.gov); 'Nylund, Erik (Tester) (Erik_Nylund@tester.senate.gov)'
Subject: CFAC Questions

Rebecca,

Earlier this week I was able to talk with Susan Nicosia with the City of Columbia Falls. They were very happy with Mike's presentation and the information he shared at last week's City Council meeting. They would like for him to continue to come to these meetings and keep the lines of information open. As Mike noted, there has been conflicting information in related media stories which leads to fear and confusion within the community. This upcoming week Glencore is sending up its representatives to talk to community leaders about the NPL process, as they did in November.

Ms. Nicosia asked the EPA the specific questions your staff answered; she then asked the same ones to Glencore as well. Glencore's response is attached and it has some different information from what EPA provided.

A town hall meeting may not be necessary right now, but we think the press and the community at large deserves to have some of these questions answered directly by the EPA. The idea of factsheets and maybe some more in-depth background for the press may help clear up some of the uncertainty the community is feeling.

Here's what seems would be helpful:

1. EPA fact sheets publicly available providing as much information about the process as possible. Also, specifically addressing what criteria must be met to move forward with an alternative process, and if that process is somehow faster as is being asserted by some involved. EPA indicated the substance of both the alternative and Superfund processes are essentially the same, but it is clear in conversations with local residents that this remains a major source of confusion in the larger community.
2. EPA could ideally include a timeline of activity and how the process ended up where it currently sits. The public should have an understanding of how this could have been a voluntary vs. compulsory cleanup, and where different jurisdictions had potential oversight. EPA noted to us the company had an opportunity to enter into some sort of agreement prior to the NPL listing.
3. EPA mentioned the ability to provide some detailed background to media outlets to help avoid more confusion. Mike noted confusion in some articles about the process and project oversight. The complex issue of jurisdiction over removal of infrastructure and contaminants seems to need some clarification.

4. It seems prudent to plan a community style meeting within the next couple of months to answer questions that will surely come.
5. Some of the concerns about any listing are redevelopment and returning the site to productive use. It would be helpful to the community to hear of EPA success stories on similar sites.

While we appreciate the willingness EPA has shown to provide information to local elected officials, there appears to be a problem in information flowing to the public. We feel it's best to have information coming directly from EPA to the public in the most accurate and transparent manner possible. That will avoid the possibility of losing anything in translation and hopefully place everyone on the same page.

Chad Campbell
Regional Director-Northwest Montana
U.S. Senator Jon Tester
8 Third St. East - Kalispell, MT 59901
406-257-3360 (direct line) 406-257-3974 (fax)
chad_campbell@tester.senate.gov